



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen)

later: Mrs. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania)

UN LIBRARY

DEC 16 1982

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 65: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 64: COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS

AGENDA ITEM 62: INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE
- (b) SECOND UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE EXPLORATION AND PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE EXPLORATION AND PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

AGENDA ITEM 63: PREPARATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE USE BY STATES OF ARTIFICIAL EARTH SATELLITES FOR DIRECT TELEVISION BROADCASTING: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 131: QUESTION OF THE REVIEW OF THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL LIABILITY FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY SPACE OBJECTS (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/37/SR.33
26 November 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 65: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

1. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) said that he wished to draw attention to the press release (GA/SPC/1679) covering the Committee's thirty-second meeting, at which his delegation had delivered the second part of a lengthy statement on agenda item 65. The press release in question had devoted less than a page to the Iraqi statement, however. The press releases were extremely important since the summary records of the Committee's deliberations would be issued only much later. The press releases should therefore be balanced and give fair and equal treatment to every member of the Committee. Despite earlier complaints, the Department responsible for producing the press releases had continued its practice of giving unequal treatment to Committee members, and he urged it to try to deal with the question fairly in the future.

2. The CHAIRMAN observed that the representative of Iraq was the first to raise the question of press releases at the current session. The question had, however, been raised by several delegations at the previous session and also in earlier years. At the beginning of the current session, he had read out a DPI statement on press releases to the effect that the latter were issued for use by representatives of the mass media and in no way constituted an official, verbatim or summary record of the Committee's deliberations. He would none the less convey to DPI the remarks made by the representative of Iraq.

AGENDA ITEM 64: COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE QUESTION OF PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS

3. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan) observed that the primary purpose of the United Nations was the maintenance of international peace and security. The Organization had made a great contribution to that endeavour through its peace-keeping operations, which had prevented the recurrence or escalation of disputes in a number of places. His Government attached great importance to those operations and had co-operated as fully as possible in efforts to strengthen the role of the United Nations in that field.

4. Although some progress had been made in drawing up guidelines for peace-keeping operations, the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations had so far been unable to complete its work owing to differences of opinion among the major Powers. The most essential prerequisite for the completion of such guidelines was the political will of permanent members of the Security Council, to whom was entrusted primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

5. The Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations was also responsible for considering practical measures related to peace-keeping operations. Since the consideration of practical measures would be conducive to the completion of

(Mr. Nisibori, Japan)

the guidelines as well, that Committee should seriously consider such practical measures even before the guidelines were completed. His delegation also hoped that the Special Committee would continue its efforts to achieve a consensus in completing the guidelines and deciding on practical measures.

6. In his annual report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General had expressed deep concern at the current state of United Nations peace-keeping functions and had pointed to the responsibilities which Member States must bear for enhancing such functions. The Japanese Government had long stressed the need to strengthen the United Nations peace-keeping functions and, in his statement to the General Assembly at its current session, Japan's Minister for Foreign Affairs had made a number of suggestions to that end. His delegation appealed to all Member States to consider seriously ways and means of strengthening the United Nations peace-keeping functions, taking full account of the suggestions made by the Secretary-General and by Japan's Minister for Foreign Affairs.

7. Mr. ABOUCHAER (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the United Nations was the most important instrument of the international community for the maintenance of international peace and security and had, for that reason, been entrusted under the Charter with the adoption of measures to prevent or remove threats to peace and to suppress acts of hostility and other breaches of the peace. The Organization's peace-keeping operations were a vital part of its efforts to that end, and all aspired to increase their effectiveness. As long as the United Nations continued to perform such a duty, it was necessary to establish a precise régime to ensure the achievement of the desired goal in the most effective manner.

8. The Secretary-General had recognized the importance of the question in his first report on the work of the Organization. He had, in particular, referred to the crisis affecting the United Nations system for collective security and warned that the world was perilously near to a new international anarchy. The Secretary-General would not have reached that conclusion had it not been for the blatant disregard for the principles of the Charter and the open defiance of United Nations resolutions by certain régimes and the inability of the Security Council either to adopt or implement resolutions. The world had reached that state because of the aggressive attitude of certain régimes which strove to realize their selfish interests without consideration for their obligations under the Charter. Although the United Nations had no goal more important than the maintenance of international peace and security, it had failed again and again to achieve it.

9. The failure had never been clearer than in the past few months, particularly in the Middle East. Israel continued to defy the United Nations and the latter's physical presence, as represented by UNIFIL in Lebanon, and continued to support the forces of its client Saad Haddad. Its latest act of aggression against Lebanon and the consequent destruction constituted new evidence of that failure and reaffirmed the tendency of some aggressive régimes, such as Israel, to bypass the United Nations peace-keeping role. Those permanent members of the Security Council which made a practice of defending aggression should adopt a more responsible approach to situations threatening international peace and security.

/...

(Mr. Abouchaer, Syrian Arab Republic)

10. In spite of the fact that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations had not managed to draw up guidelines, his delegation felt that, as long as there were areas of tension in the world and as long as United Nations peace-keeping operations remained essential for the implementation of the Charter, the Special Committee should continue its efforts to complete the guidelines. There were common factors characterizing the conduct of such operations, and it should be possible to identify and draft general principles on such matters as the composition of the force, the definition of its functions and legal competence, the time-frame for its mission and the renewal of its mandate.

11. When those guidelines were being drawn up, a number of points should be borne in mind. The process should be guided by General Assembly resolution 1874 (S-IV), on the principles governing peace-keeping operations, including the implicit principle that the aggressor and the victim of aggression should not be placed on an equal footing. The principle that the aggressor should bear the full consequences of his aggression should be reaffirmed and the aggressor should therefore bear the full financial cost of peace-keeping operations. His delegation could not accept the idea that the State which had been the victim of aggression should be required to contribute in any way to such expenditure.

12. The temporary character of peace-keeping operations should also be reaffirmed. His delegation could not accept that the presence of United Nations forces should be used to perpetuate aggression and the aggressor should not be allowed to profit from that presence in order to impose a new fait accompli. Moreover, the presence of United Nations forces should under no circumstances be allowed to become a substitute for the solution of those disputes which had brought about their intervention. It was important that all parties should undertake to co-operate fully with United Nations forces in order to ensure success in carrying out their task, to guarantee respect for the United Nations and to prevent any obstruction of its role in maintaining international peace and security.

13. His delegation hoped that the Special Committee would be able to make progress in its work in 1983, and it paid tribute to those who had given their lives or who had been wounded in the service of international peace and security.

14. Mr. HANSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, said that the United Nations peace-keeping role, primary responsibility for which rested with the Security Council, was fundamental to the effective implementation of the Charter. The Ten therefore supported the various peace-keeping operations undertaken within the framework of the United Nations.

15. Peace-keeping operations had, by definition, a limited purpose, namely to achieve and maintain stability in an area of crisis, thereby contributing to an atmosphere conducive to political negotiations between the parties concerned with a view to finding a peaceful solution. The presence of United Nations peace-keeping forces could not and must not be construed as a substitute for a settlement.

(Mr. Hansen, Denmark)

16. The basic requirements for the success of peace-keeping operations were the co-operation of all parties to the conflict, a clearly defined mandate from the Security Council and the Council's full backing at all times. Not only must the parties concerned co-operate with United Nations forces and show the requisite restraint, but they must also make full use of the time at their disposal to strive for a permanent and peaceful settlement.

17. In his 1982 report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General had emphasized that peace-keeping operations were based on the assumption that the parties, in accepting such an operation, committed themselves to co-operating with it. He had also stated that United Nations peace-keeping operations were not equipped, authorized or made available to take part in military activities other than peace-keeping and that their main strength lay in the will of the international community which they symbolized. The Ten shared that view and endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendation that Member States, especially members of the Security Council, should study urgently ways of strengthening peace-keeping operations.

18. The Secretary-General had also emphasized that peace-keeping operations were the visible part of a complex framework of political and diplomatic efforts and of countervailing pressures designed to keep the peace-keeping efforts effective. If that framework broke down, there was little that a United Nations peace-keeping force could do on its own to rectify the situation.

19. The need for the full co-operation of all parties had been clearly demonstrated by recent events in Lebanon. Israel had elected to overrun UNIFIL with massive military might, showing lack of respect for the United Nations and its peace-keeping force. Israeli units and the de facto forces which Israel supported still remained in UNIFIL's area of operations, rendering the Force's mandate largely inoperative. The Ten were deeply disturbed by that attack on the authority and prestige of the United Nations.

20. The Ten noted that the Security Council, in extending UNIFIL's current mandate for a further interim period, had also authorized the Force to carry out, with the consent of the Lebanese Government, interim humanitarian and administrative tasks and to assist that Government in assuring the security of all inhabitants of the area without discrimination. The Ten called on all parties to give the Force the necessary co-operation to carry out those important additional tasks.

21. UNIFIL had faced and still faced a very difficult task. Some of the Ten were contributing troops to it, as well as to the Multinational Force in Lebanon. They hoped that those efforts would create prospects for peace in the area, permitting the withdrawal of all foreign forces.

22. The continued presence of UNFICYP in Cyprus demonstrated the United Nations concern to maintain peace, security and stability in that country. UNFICYP's presence remained an important factor for the continuation of efforts to achieve

/...

(Mr. Hansen, Denmark)

a negotiated, just and lasting peace settlement of the Cyprus problem. Other United Nations peace-keeping operations also deserved commendation.

23. The Ten were concerned at the serious difficulties which were being experienced in financing peace-keeping operations. All Member States had an obligation to contribute their assessed share to the cost of such operations. Those who contributed by training and equipping troops and giving logistical support often carried a disproportionate financial burden. It was most regrettable that some Member States were failing to honour their obligations, thereby placing an additional financial burden on troop-contributing States, which included a number of developing countries. That might undermine political willingness to participate in peace-keeping operations in the future and thereby jeopardize efficient United Nations action when it was urgently needed.

24. The Ten reiterated their hope that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations would renew its efforts to draw up guidelines for the conduct of peace-keeping operations in accordance with the Charter and to consider practical measures for facilitating such operations.

25. Over the years, peace-keeping operations had often been undertaken in very difficult circumstances and, in achieving considerable success against tremendous odds, had enhanced the standing of the United Nations. The Ten reaffirmed their confidence in the manner in which the Secretary-General had conducted such operations on behalf of the United Nations, commended those Governments which had contributed forces and equipment and paid tribute to the soldiers of many countries who had bravely participated in such operations, particularly those who had suffered injury or given their lives in the performance of their peace-keeping function.

26. Mr. SHEHATA (Egypt) said that, as a member both of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and of the Working Group, and taking into account the relevant parts of the annotated agenda for the current session and of General Assembly resolution 36/37, his delegation wished to propose that the Working Group should initiate informal consultations with a view to drafting a procedural resolution renewing the mandate of that Committee for a further year.

27. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should defer consideration of that proposal to a subsequent meeting.

28. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 62: INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE
(continued) (A/SPC/37/L.6, L.7 and L.9)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

- (b) SECOND UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE EXPLORATION AND PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE EXPLORATION AND PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

AGENDA ITEM 63: PREPARATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE USE BY STATES OF ARTIFICIAL EARTH SATELLITES FOR DIRECT TELEVISION BROADCASTING: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (continued) (A/SPC/37/L.5/Rev.1)

AGENDA ITEM 131: QUESTION OF THE REVIEW OF THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL LIABILITY FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY SPACE OBJECTS (continued) (A/SPC/37/L.8)

Draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.5/Rev.1

29. Mr. BUENO (Brazil), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.5/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution was motivated by the general concern felt by many States at the impact of space technology when used indiscriminately and without the necessary regulation required by peaceful coexistence and the harmonious development of relations among States.
30. The draft set of principles contained in draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.5 had reflected the views of virtually all Member States and had been endorsed by the Group of 77 at UNISPACE 82. Since the Conference, the 16 sponsors had made a final effort at the current session to draw up a consensus text. Unfortunately, that had proved impossible, although a number of alternative proposals had been considered. However, the commercialization of direct television broadcasting by satellite required that international rules regulating such broadcasting should be adopted urgently.
31. Ever since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2916 (XXVII), the Legal Sub-Committee of the Outer Space Committee had laboured to adopt a draft set of principles on the subject, with the result that the text now before the Committee was well known to members. Perhaps the most important feature of the draft was its non-discriminatory spirit. While recognizing the special responsibilities of those who possessed the technological means to conduct direct television broadcasting by satellite, it safeguarded the sovereign rights of all States, especially receiving States, which must give their consent before such broadcasting to their populations could be introduced. That prerogative was well covered in the draft, but without prejudice to the free flow and mutual exchange of information, knowledge and ideas; that exchange should promote mutual understanding, friendly relations and co-operation among States and peoples, assist in educational, social and economic development, particularly in the developing countries, and provide recreation and enhance the quality of life for all.
32. The draft also stressed the principles of international co-operation, State responsibility for activities in the field of direct television broadcasting by satellite and the need for prior consultations between States willing to establish a broadcasting service, without prejudice to the relevant ITU instruments.

(Mr. Bueno, Brazil)

33. The highest expression of co-operation in outer space matters was to be found in the furthering of an orderly development of space activities. Such activities should take into account the interests of all countries and encourage both the advancement of space technology and the parallel extension of the rule of law to outer space. The self-centred development of space technologies could, in the long run, harm even the technologically most advanced States. It was in that spirit that the sponsors recommended the draft set of principles for adoption by the General Assembly.

Draft resolutions A/SPC/37/L.6, L.7, and L.8.

34. Mr. LINDAHL (United States of America) referring to the statement of administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7, as contained in document A/SPC/37/L.9, said that his delegation was concerned at the Secretariat's apparent failure to understand the thrust of paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7, specifically the intention that new or expanded activities were to be funded through voluntary contributions and through the rearrangement of priorities within the 1983-1984 budget. The trouble seemed to stem from the use of the word "mainly" in paragraph 9 of that resolution. In his delegation's interpretation, that word referred to the possible division of resources between voluntary contributions and those provided under the next programme budget. It certainly did not allow for additional expenditure under the current budget. He therefore urged the Committee to refer the statement of financial implications (A/SPC/37/L.9) back to the Secretary-General for redrafting.

35. His delegation had particular reservations with regard to paragraph 3 of document A/SPC/37/L.9: it was not proper for the United Nations budget to be burdened with an established post at the D-1 or any other level, the main function of which would seem to be the solicitation of contributions from Member States. It also had considerable reservations about the desirability of the P-5 post proposed in that paragraph. It was his Government's position that United Nations technical assistance activities should be funded by voluntary rather than assessed resources and his delegation could not, therefore, readily support a draft resolution which provided for the further use of regular budgetary resources for such activities. He therefore proposed that action on draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 should be deferred until the Committee received an assurance from the Secretary-General that its adoption would have no financial implications or that document A/SPC/37/L.9 would be revised to eliminate the problems he had just mentioned. If other members of the Committee did not agree to that proposal, his delegation reserved the right to submit an amendment to draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7.

36. Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria) said that the laudable speed with which the Secretary-General had submitted the statement of the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 showed that he wished to maintain the momentum generated by UNISPACE 82 and allow the space applications programme to be quickly expanded and redirected. However, it was not at all clear that the arrangements provided for in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's statement (A/SPC/37/L.9) would serve those goals. Paragraph 3 was ambiguous, and the basic

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

purpose and political intent of the additional appropriations recommended had not been defined. Indeed, the draft resolution in question should have no financial implications for 1983 since the budgetary allocations in respect of the proposals it set forth had already been approved by COPUOS in the 1982-1983 budget as contained in document A/AC.105/L.127.

37. Nigeria reiterated its position that whatever the resources and voluntary contributions made available to the Outer Space Affairs Division they should not be dissipated through the proliferation of bureaucratic machinery but should be directed judiciously to specific projects which would be of benefit to developing countries. Nigeria expected the Outer Space Affairs Division to provide specific proposals for consideration by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee at its next session. In the meantime, no financial and administrative implications could realistically be assessed for non-existent proposals. The various recommendations of the Conference were too important to be implemented in any but a systematic, solidly based and specific way.

38. While the Secretary-General's recommendation in paragraph 3 to convert the D-1 post of the expert on space applications to an established post was a step in the right direction, the ostensible limitation of his role to fund-raising was neither cost-effective nor subject-specific. It was, moreover, difficult to understand which of his responsibilities or functions were being referred to as full-time. In addition, the functions of the new P-5 post for a senior technical officer also proposed in paragraph 3 had not been specified.

39. Nigeria felt that scientific studies would be of great interest but as far as it knew neither the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee nor COPUOS itself had recommended any studies for endorsement by the current session of the General Assembly, just as UNISPACE 82 had not recommended any specific study for 1983. In any case, since no studies could be carried out without prior discussion and authorization by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and COPUOS, it was not possible to speak of financial and administrative implications deriving from studies.

40. It should be pointed out that paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 clearly stated the recommendation of the Conference that all new or expanded activities should be funded from the regular 1984-85 budget. Nigeria felt very strongly that document A/SPC/37/L.9 had not made the case for the financial and administrative implications of the draft resolution in question.

41. Mrs. Ould Dada (Mauritania) took the Chair.

42. The CHAIRMAN announced that Pakistan had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.5/Rev.1.

43. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria) said that it would be advisable to ask the representative of the Budget Division to clarify the points raised concerning document A/SPC/37/L.9.

/...

44. Mr. BEGIN (Budget Division) said, in response to the comments of the representatives of the United States, Nigeria and Austria, that the Budget Division had studied draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 jointly with the substantive Department to determine how the Secretariat could implement paragraphs 7 and 8. It had decided on a programme of work based on those paragraphs, and meticulously reviewed the implications for all services concerned, after which it had gone on to scrutinize with particular care the provisions of paragraph 9. The United States delegation in particular could rest assured that paragraph 9 had been very carefully studied with a view to allowing the Secretariat to carry out its mandate while at the same time economizing as strictly as possible.

45. The draft resolution in question, if adopted, would authorize a very substantial programme of work with some inevitable implications for the regular budget that would not be covered by possible redeployments and voluntary contributions. The Secretary-General had stated what those implications would be. However, the costs had been kept to an absolute minimum. A permanent P-5 post had been requested in paragraph 3 of document A/SPC/37/L.9, and its provisional cost in the 1983 budget would constitute - unless extrabudgetary sources could be found - the basic additional requirement for funds. It had been possible to transfer consultant funds to finance a D-1 post, and a way had been found of redeploying funds for a P-4 post. The Secretariat was therefore relying essentially on redeployments wherever possible. In addition, paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's statement reviewed the total estimated staff costs and common services requirements for implementing the draft resolution in question, as required under rules 153 and 154 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure.

46. Document A/SPC/37/L.9 was not a definitive document and naturally it was subject to discussion. Statements of administrative and financial implications were, of course, always forwarded for review to the Fifth Committee via the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, and the Fifth Committee had the last word on all proposals.

47. Mr. THORNE (United Kingdom) thanked the representative of the Budget Division for his comments but said that he had some sympathy with those delegations, particularly Nigeria, which felt that the case for the financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 had been made only imperfectly in document A/SPC/37/L.9. A number of the statements in that latter document were somewhat speculative and paragraph 6 implied that the draft resolution in question would entail no additional implications during 1983. Perhaps the Committee should not move precipitately and prejudge the issue, and the Fifth Committee should first be given an opportunity to consider the financial implications.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no further comments he would put draft resolutions A/SPC/37/L.6, A/SPC/37/L.7 and A/SPC/37/L.8 to the vote.

49. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that to his knowledge no delegation had opposed the proposals made by the United States and Nigeria and he assumed that meant that the Committee was in favour of those proposals.

50. Mr. LINDAHL (United States of America) said that he was confused as to the procedures the Committee was following. He had proposed that document A/SPC/37/L.9 should be returned to the Secretariat for redrafting and reconsideration. Other delegations also had reservations about that document. Was the Chairman going to take action on his proposal? If not, his delegation wished to propose an amendment to draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7.

51. Mr. BEGIN (Budget Division) reiterated that the Secretary-General's statement in document A/SPC/37/L.9 had been very carefully weighed after a thorough study of all the aspects involved, and represented the Secretariat's view of the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7. He could therefore see no way in which the Secretariat could reconsider it. He wished to remind Members, however, that if the draft resolution was adopted the financial implications would be considered in greater detail by the Fifth Committee, which could then modify them as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

52. Mr. LINDAHL (United States of America) said that, although he realized that the representative of the Budget Division had attempted to clarify the points in question, he was more confused now by his comments than by document A/SPC/37/L.9 itself. If the Chairman intended to put draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 to a vote, the United States had an amendment to propose.

53. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria) thanked the representative of the Budget Division for what she felt had been completely clear and satisfactory explanations.

54. She recalled that Austria had submitted draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 after long consultations and said that it faithfully represented the recommendations of UNISPACE 82. When the Conference had produced its lengthy report adopted by full consensus on a matter of great sensitivity, there had been a general feeling that the time had been well spent. The Conference had had before it a tentative statement of the financial implications of all recommendations (document A/CONF.101/3/Add.1) and it had been constantly referred to throughout the deliberations; the concern of the Conference in that connection had been reflected in paragraph 423 of its final report. It was therefore surprising to learn that some delegations had not expected any financial implications from the recommendations of the Conference.

55. Those recommendations were eminently practical. The Conference had scrupulously avoided establishing any large new structures or ambitious funds. It had, however, assigned new duties to the Outer Space Affairs Division, and that Division must now be strengthened with additional technical personnel and new financial resources. There would be a rearrangement of priorities when the 1984-1985 budget was established. Meanwhile, a provisional appropriation of \$120,000 had been recommended. Surely that was a modest amount, especially when compared with the cost of follow-up of other conferences and when the importance and usefulness to all States of the recommendations involved were considered. To put the matter in perspective, it should be recalled that the Conference itself had cost the United Nations \$3 million and the Austrian Government \$2 million, not considering voluntary contributions and expenses by the various delegations.

(Mrs. Nowotny, Austria)

56. Austria had in the past always spoken out in the appropriate General Assembly forum for good management, fiscal prudence and economy. The Committee was now taking a decision on the implementation of a conference report and she concurred with the representative of the Budget Division that the subject of financial implications was best dealt with analytically and comprehensively by those specialists with an overall view of the problem, namely, by ACABQ and the Fifth Committee. Therefore, Austria could see no reason not to take a decision immediately on draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7.

57. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was apparent that the Secretariat could not reformulate its statement of the financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 and that a number of delegations could not endorse the recommendations of the Secretariat. Under the circumstances, the Committee should turn for assistance to organs such as the Fifth Committee and ACABQ.

58. Mr. DIMITRIJEVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation shared the views expressed by the representative of Austria and was prepared to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7.

59. Mr. RODRIGUEZ-MEDINA (Colombia) expressed surprise that the Committee's discussion had come to a halt over the sum of \$120,000, which was minimal as compared with the cost of a single spacesuit of a United States astronaut (\$2 million).

60. Mr. BAALI (Algeria) said that the financial implications of the draft resolution had been clarified in the statement by the representative of the Budget Division; consequently, there was no need to refer the draft resolution back to the Secretariat.

61. Mr. LINDAHL (United States of America) proposed that paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 should be amended by the addition of the words: "but in no case will financial obligations incurred exceed the level of resources approved in the 1982-1983 programme budget (General Assembly resolution 36/240)".

62. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria) reminded the Committee that draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 had been elaborated in the course of negotiations between her own and other delegations; furthermore, her delegation's position on the financial implications of the draft resolution and the United Nations budget were known. Therefore, her delegation could not accept the amendment proposed by the United States.

63. Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria) maintained that, as a matter of procedure, a vote could not be taken on draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 until a decision had been reached with respect to document A/SPC/37/L.9.

64. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) insisted that a decision should be taken on his earlier suggestion that the financial implications in document A/SPC/37/L.9 should be submitted to the Fifth Committee for clarification.

65. The CHAIRMAN said that, if she heard no objections, she would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.6 without a vote.

66. Draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.6 was adopted without a vote.

67. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the United States amendment to draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7.

In favour: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, Viet Nam.

68. The United States amendment was rejected by 61 votes to 18, with 29 abstentions.*

69. The CHAIRMAN said that, if she heard no objections, she would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 without a vote.

70. Draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 was adopted without a vote.

* Subsequently the delegation of the United Arab Emirates informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.

71. The CHAIRMAN said that, if she heard no objections, she would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.8 without a vote.

72. Draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.8 was adopted without a vote.

73. The CHAIRMAN invited those who so wished to explain their vote.

74. Mr. LINDAHL (United States of America) said he was pleased to have participated in the adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 by consensus; his delegation believed, however, that the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 of the draft resolution were inappropriate and injurious to the proceedings of UNISPACE 82. Although those paragraphs used language taken from the report of the Vienna Conference, they emphasized only one recommendation of that Conference, thereby placing the other recommendations in a secondary light. It was inappropriate for the Special Political Committee to set priorities that had not been set by UNISPACE 82 with regard to the military use of outer space.

75. In the Fifth Committee, his delegation would pursue its objections to the financial implications of the draft resolution. Furthermore, his delegation's participation in the consensus should not be considered as a guarantee that it would take the same position in the plenary Assembly.

76. Mr. THORNE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation attached great importance to the tradition of consensus in both the Special Political Committee and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. It had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7, despite some serious reservations regarding its content. Delegations that were also members of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space would recall that the question of military uses of outer space had arisen only lately, and at the insistence of some delegations, in the Committee's consideration of that draft resolution.

77. Most of the wording used with respect to the military uses of outer space in the draft resolution had been drawn from paragraphs 13, 14 and 426 of the UNISPACE 82 report, which were the only paragraphs in the entire report dealing with the military aspects of outer space. In paragraph 426, the Conference had strongly recommended that the competent organs of the United Nations, particularly the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament, should give appropriate attention and high priority to the grave concern expressed in paragraphs 13 and 14. In his delegation's view, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space did not constitute such a competent body.

78. In recent resolutions of the General Assembly, the Committee on Disarmament had been urged to take up the issue. However, those resolutions had originated in the First Committee, which was the appropriate source of such resolutions, since arms control in space could not be considered separately from arms control on earth. At the same time, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space lacked the requisite military expertise to deal with the question; moreover, its doing so would duplicate the valuable work of the Committee on Disarmament. While his delegation shared the concern about the dangers described in the UNISPACE 82 report, it was dismayed that the valuable work of the Committee on the Peaceful

(Mr. Thorne, United Kingdom)

Uses of Outer Space was being increasingly subordinated to questions which were rightly within the competence of other Committees.

79. He drew attention to paragraph 12 of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7, which emphasized the need for close co-operation between all United Nations bodies engaging in space or space-related activities. Such co-operation was necessary because it would ensure that maximum benefits would be derived from such activities and would avoid any duplication of efforts.

80. Mr. ROCHEREAU de la SABLIERE (France) said that his delegation had favoured the adoption of the three draft resolutions. With regard to paragraph 4 of resolution A/SPC/37/L.7, his delegation had already stressed in the First Committee the dangers of military uses of space and the need to protect satellites; at the previous session of the General Assembly, his delegation had been a sponsor of resolution 36/97 C on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. He stressed that an arms race in space was a phenomenon of disarmament; consequently, the matter should be dealt with by the Committee on Disarmament. Since the General Assembly had decided that the First Committee, rather than the Special Political Committee, would be responsible for discussion of the arms race in space, it was unfortunate that draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 contained a paragraph on that subject.

81. Mr. SAINT-MARTIN (Canada) said that the references to the arms race in the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 did not entirely reflect the consensus reached on that topic at UNISPACE 82 as indicated in paragraphs 13, 14 and 426 of the Conference report. His delegation had submitted a working paper on the arms race to the Committee on Disarmament, at its most recent session; that body was the proper forum for such discussion. His delegation believed that the consensus on draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 should be taken to imply acceptance of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space as the competent body to discuss that issue.

82. Mr. CRAENEN (Netherlands) said that, during the negotiations on draft resolution A/SPC.37/L.7, his delegation had asked to have reference made in the operative part to Mr. Yash Pal, Secretary-General of the Vienna Conference and his staff. However, the current text referred only to the Conference secretariat, and then only in the preambular part; in his delegation's view, the draft failed to give adequate credit for the success of the conference to those who deserved it.

83. Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) said that his delegation had participated in UNISPACE 82; he could therefore attest to the near unanimity of Conference participants in their condemnation of the use of outer space for military purposes. Such a use ran counter to man's heritage. Furthermore, his delegation believed that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was the appropriate body to deal with the question, since the Committee on Disarmament was already faced with an extremely high work load. The military use of outer space must be condemned, and therefore the adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 was appropriate.

/...

84. Mr. DIMITRIJEVIC (Yugoslavia) expressed his delegation's satisfaction that the draft resolutions had been adopted by consensus, especially draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7. With regard to the vote on the United States amendment he shared the sponsor's concern at the expanding of the United Nations budget and was ready to help curb all unnecessary expenditure; however, financial economy was not the sole consideration.

85. Mr. SUAREZ (Philippines) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.7 and was pleased that the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 specifically referred to the extension of the arms race into outer space. His delegation would have supported an even stronger statement on that subject. While he shared the concern of most speakers at the extension of the arms race into outer space, he disagreed that the Special Political Committee did not have jurisdiction in that area. As the question was one that concerned all of humanity, it should be discussed in all possible forums.

86. Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria) said that, although his delegation expected that the outcome of UNISPACE 82 would contribute to the development of all countries, especially the developing countries, it had reservations with regard to the financial implications in document A/SPC/37/L.9.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.